DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FROM THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

October 1999

Prepared under Contract by:

American Institutes for Research
Contract No. EA97001001

For:

The U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary

DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FROM THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

October 1999

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary of Education
Planning and Evaluation Service
Washington, DC 20202

Prepared by:

Michael S. Garet
Beatrice F. Birman
Andrew C. Porter
Laura Desimone
Rebecca Herman
with Kwang Suk Yoon

Project Management:

Andrew C. Porter, Principal Investigator, Wisconsin Center for Education Research
Beatrice F. Birman, Project Director, American Institutes for Research
Michael S. Garet, Deputy Project Director, American Institutes for Research

The report was prepared pursuant to Contract Number EA97001001, U.S. Department of Education (Elizabeth Eisner, Project Officer).

The views expressed herein are those of the contractor. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Office of the Under Secretary
Marshall S. Smith
Under Secretary (A)

Planning and Evaluation Service
Alan L. Ginsburg
Director

October 1999

This book is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service, *Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program*, Washington, D.C., 1999.

To order copies for this report, write:

ED Pubs
Editorial Publications Center
U.S. Department of Education
P.O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 20794-1398

Or via electronic mail, send your request to:
Edpubs@inet.ed.gov.

You may also call toll-free: 1-877-433-7827 (1-877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 1-800-872-5327 (1-800-USA-LEARN). Those whose use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY), should call 1-800-437-0833.

To order online, point your Internet browser to: www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html.

This report is also available on the Department's web site at:
http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/eval/elem.html#Math/Science.

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center (202) 205-8113.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program has depended on the talents of many individuals. First, we would like to express our sincere appreciation to the teachers, state and district coordinators, and project directors who took time out of their busy schedules to complete our surveys and interviews. We owe a special debt to those principals and teachers who allowed us into their schools and classrooms.

We extend our thanks to our design team members—Mary Kennedy, Susan Loucks-Horsley, Jennifer O'Day, Senta Raizen, Thomas Romberg, and Norman Webb. Their expert advice guided the design of the evaluation and the collection of data, and improved its products. We particularly appreciate Mary Kennedy's extensive, and good-natured, comments on this report.

We are grateful to Elizabeth Eisner, our project officer at the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) Planning and Evaluation Service for her contribution to conceptualizing the study and helping us understand the nature and intentions of the program, and for consistently providing helpful, reflective and timely feedback and comments. We also extend our appreciation to Ricky Takai, Director of Post Secondary Adult and Vocational Education, Division of the Planning and Evaluation Service, and Alan Ginsburg, Director of the Planning and Evaluation Service, for their continued support throughout the project. In addition, we thank Audrey Smith, Program Specialist, Eisenhower Professional Development Program, and Arthur Cole, Director of the School Improvement Programs within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, for sharing their knowledge about the operations of the Eisenhower program, and their openness to evaluation results. Several others at the Department of Education—Laurette Crum, Stacy Kotzin, John Luczak, Richard Mellman, Val Plisko, Heidi Ramirez, and Linda Rosen—provided us with helpful comments. We also thank John Drake, Dolores Mize, and Douglas Walker for their comments and feedback on the report from the state perspective.

This evaluation is truly a team effort, and individuals from several organizations contributed to this report. From AIR, we appreciate the contributions of: Dan Aladjem, Kristine Burnaska, Cecily Darden, Barbara Lovitts, Alison Reeve, and Cheryl Sattler in designing data collection instruments, reviewing the research literature and the report itself, managing data collection and analysis, or writing early drafts of sections of the report; Stacey Daughters, Susan Kehnemui, Gaby Phillips, John Ryan, Jessica Saltz, Ann Scorza, Sunny Tom, and Eric Wolff for their tireless efforts in data collection and reporting, editing, and production; and Tony Johnson and Arlinda Morris, for their excellent graphics and word processing efforts. From the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER), we thank John Smithson for assistance in instrument design and data analysis, and Lois Opalewski for her patience and responsiveness in acting as liaison between AIR and the WCER. From Wested, we appreciate the efforts of Joyce Kaser and Susan Mundry in helping to conduct site visits and observations of professional development activities.

Without the assistance of all of these dedicated individuals, this study would have been impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF INDICATORS vii

LIST OF EXHIBITS viii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF THE EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND THE DESIGN OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION

THE POLICY CONTEXT FOR THE REAUTHORIZED EISENHOWER PROGRAM 1-2

THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM AND THE GOALS OF THE 1994 REAUTHORIZATION ... 1-6

APPROACH TO EVALUATION OF THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM 1-11

OVERVIEW OF THIS REPORT 1-16

CHAPTER 2: TEACHING PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

EFFECTIVE CONTENT AND PEDAGOGY 2-4

CONTENT COVERAGE AND HIGH STANDARDS 2-7

PEDAGOGY AND HIGH STANDARDS 2-26

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 2-33

CHAPTER 3: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES IN EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

STRUCTURAL FEATURES 3-8

CORE FEATURES 3-19

TEACHER OUTCOMES 3-39

PARTICIPATION OF TEACHERS FROM HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS 3-47

WHAT FEATURES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MAKE A DIFFERENCE FOR TEACHER OUTCOMES? 3-51

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 3-55

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER 4: DISTRICT "PORTFOLIOS" OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

DISTRICT PORTFOLIOS' EMPHASIS ON MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE 4-5

STRUCTURAL AND CORE FEATURES OF DISTRICT EISENHOWER PORTFOLIOS 4-11

TARGETING AND RECRUITMENT OF TEACHERS 4-36

DIFFERENCES IN DISTRICT PORTFOLIOS OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT POVERTY AND SIZE 4-44

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 4-46

CHAPTER 5: DISTRICT MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

BUILDING A VISION FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: ALIGNMENT WITH STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS, AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS 5-5

IMPLEMENTING THE VISION: DISTRICT PROCEDURES FOR THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES 5-22

THE ROLE OF TEACHERS IN PLANNING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 5-33

MEETING THE NEEDS OF TEACHERS VS. SCHOOLS: THE 80/20 RULE 5-40

DIFFERENCES IN MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT POVERTY AND SIZE 5-44

THE RELATIONSHIP OF DISTRICT MANAGEMENT TO FEATURES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 5-45

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 5-49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER 6: STATE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTEES: FEATURES AND MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

CHARACTERISTICS OF IHE/NPO RECIPIENTS OF EISENHOWER GRANTS 6-6

STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF SAHE-GRANTEE-PROVIDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 6-9

CORE FEATURES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 6-22

TARGETING AND RECRUITMENT OF TEACHERS 6-32

BUILDING A VISION FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: ALIGNMENT WITH STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS, AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS 6-37

IMPLEMENTING THE VISION: IHE/NPO PROCEDURES FOR THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES 6-49

DIFFERENCES IN SAHE-GRANTEE PROJECTS BY INSTITUTION TYPE AND DEPARTMENTAL AFFILIATION 6-55

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SAHE-GRANTEE MANAGEMENT TO FEATURES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 6-57

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 6-59

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS FOR THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

STRENGTHS OF THE DATA 7-2

CURRENT TEACHING PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE 7-4

TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES IN EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES 7-5

DISTRICT MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES 7-10

SAHE-GRANTEE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES 7-13

LESSONS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOMENT 7-15

LIST OF INDICATORS

CHAPTER 3: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES IN EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

INDICATOR 3.2 3-18
Sustained Professional Development

INDICATOR 2.1 3-39
District-level Professional Development

INDICATOR 3.1 3-39
High Quality

INDICATOR 1.1 3-46
Teachers' Skills and Classroom Instruction

INDICATOR 4.1 3-50
High-poverty Schools

LIST OF EXHIBITS

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF THE EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND THE DESIGN OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION

EXHIBIT 1.0 1-13
Timeline for the Evaluation

EXHIBIT 1.1 1-15
In-depth Case Studies

EXHIBIT 1.2 1-16
Exploratory Case Districts

EXHIBIT 1.3 1-17
Program Logic Model for This Evaluation

CHAPTER 2: TEACHING PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

EXHIBIT 2.0 2-1
Conceptual Framework for This Evaluation

EXHIBIT 2.1 2-9
Excerpt from Content Coverage Section of the Elementary School Mathematics Teachers Survey

EXHIBIT 2.2 2-10
Performance Goals for Students

EXHIBIT 2.3 2-12
Percentage of Emphasis on Topics in Middle School Math, Reported by NAEP and by Teachers in the Longitudinal Teacher Survey

EXHIBIT 2.4 2-14
Percentage of Emphasis Mathematics Teachers in the Longitudinal Teacher Survey Give to Measurement, by Grade

EXHIBIT 2.5 2-15
Relative Emphasis on Subtopics in Measurement by Grade, as Reported by Teachers in the Longitudinal Teacher Survey

EXHIBIT 2.6 2-17
Comparison of NAEP and Teachers in the Longitudinal Teacher Survey on Emphasis on Performance Goals

EXHIBIT 2.7 2-18
Mean Percent Emphasis Given to Each Performance Goal (Standard Deviation), by School Level, Subject, and Poverty Level

EXHIBIT 2.8 2-21
Comparison of NAEP and Teachers in the Longitudinal Teacher Survey on Coverage of Content Areas

CHAPTER 2: TEACHING PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE (Continued)

EXHIBIT 2.9a 2-23
Emphasis on Content Areas in Fourth-Grade Science NAEP Items

EXHIBIT 2.9b 2-23
Emphasis on Science Content Areas, Reported by Elementary School Teachers in the Longitudinal Teacher Survey

EXHIBIT 2.10 2-24
Degree of Alignment between Teachers' Instructional Emphases and NAEP Emphases

EXHIBIT 2.11a 2-28
Percent of Teachers Using Traditional Activities in Most or All Lessons

EXHIBIT 2.11b 2-29
Percent of Teachers Using Nontraditional Activities in Most or All Lessons

EXHIBIT 2.12 2-31
Mean Teacher Use of Four Pedagogical Approaches (Standard Deviation), by School Level, Subject, and Poverty Level

EXHIBIT 2.13 2-32
Correlations between Pedagogical Approaches and Elements of Content

CHAPTER 3: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES IN EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

EXHIBIT 3.0 3-2
Conceptual Framework for This Evaluation

EXHIBIT 3.1 3-11
Percent of Teachers Reporting Participation in Traditional and Reform Types of Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.2 3-13
Contact Hours Provided by Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities, as Reported by Teachers

EXHIBIT 3.3 3-15
Time Span of Eisenhower-assisted Activities, as Reported by Teachers

EXHIBIT 3.4 3-17
Percent of Teachers Reporting School-level and Department or Grade-level Participation in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.5 3-22
Percent of Teachers Reporting a Major Emphasis on Mathematics and Science Content Knowledge in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.6 3-25
Percent of Teachers Reporting That They Had Opportunities to Observe or Be Observed Teaching in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

CHAPTER 3: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES IN EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (Continued)

EXHIBIT 3.7 3-26
Percent of Teachers Reporting Opportunities to Plan Classroom Implementation in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.8 3-28
Percent of Teachers Reporting Opportunities to Examine Student Work in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.9 3-29
Percent of Teachers Reporting Opportunities to Present, Lead, and Write in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.10 3-31
Number of Opportunities for Active Learning in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities, as Reported by Teachers

EXHIBIT 3.11 3-33
Percent of Teachers Reporting That Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities are Related to Their Other Professional Development Experiences

EXHIBIT 3.12 3-35
Percent of Teachers Reporting That Eisenhower-assisted Activities are Aligned with State and District Standards, Frameworks, and Assessments

EXHIBIT 3.13 3-36
Percent of Teachers Reporting That They Communicate with Other Teachers about Their Experiences in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.14 3-37
Degree to Which Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities Foster Coherence, as Reported by Teachers

EXHIBIT 3.15 3-41
Percent of Teachers Reporting Enhanced Knowledge and Skills Due to Participation in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.16 3-42
Extent to Which Participation in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities Enhanced Knowledge and Skills, as Reported by Teachers

EXHIBIT 3.17 3-44
Percent of Teachers Reporting Improvement in Classroom Teaching Practice Due to Participation in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

EXHIBIT 3.18 3-45
Degree of Improvement in Classroom Teaching Practice Due to Participation in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities, as Reported by Teachers

EXHIBIT 3.19 3-49
Percent of Teacher Participations in District Eisenhower-assisted Activities Compared to All Teachers in the Nation, Overall and by District Poverty

CHAPTER 3: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES IN EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (Continued)

EXHIBIT 3.20 3-50
Percent of Teacher Participations in District and SAHE Grantee Eisenhower-assisted Activities from High-poverty Schools

EXHIBIT 3.21 3-53
The Relationship of Features of Professional Development to Teacher Outcomes

CHAPTER 4: DISTRICT "PORTFOLIOS" OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

EXHIBIT 4.0 4-2
Conceptual Framework for This Evaluation

EXHIBIT 4.1 4-6
Percent of Teachers in Districts Using Eisenhower Funds to Support Professional Development Activities, by Subject Area

EXHIBIT 4.2 4-7
Percent of Participations in Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities, by Subject Area

EXHIBIT 4.3 4-13
Percent of Participations in Traditional Types of Eisenhower-assisted Activities

EXHIBIT 4.4a 4-15
Percent of Eisenhower-assisted In-district Workshops and Institutes, by Contact Hours

EXHIBIT 4.4b 4-16
Percent of Eisenhower-assisted In-district Workshops and Institutes, by Time Span

EXHIBIT 4.5a 4-18
Percent of Teachers in Districts in Which Eisenhower-assisted In-district Workshops and Institutes Include Collective Participation

EXHIBIT 4.5b 4-19
Collective Participation in Eisenhower-assisted In-district Workshops and Institutes, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.6 4-20
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Provide Each of Five Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in Eisenhower-assisted In-district Workshops and Institutes

EXHIBIT 4.7 4-21
Number of Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in Eisenhower-assisted In-district Workshops and Institutes, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.8a 4-24
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Support Reform Types of Professional Development Activities with Eisenhower Funds

EXHIBIT 4.8b 4-25
Percent of Participations in Reform Types of Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities

CHAPTER 4: DISTRICT "PORTFOLIOS" OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (Continued)

EXHIBIT 4.9a..... 4-26
Percent of Participations in Reform Types of Eisenhower-assisted Professional Development Activities, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.9b 4-26
Percent of Teacher Participations in Reform Types of Professional Development Activities, Interaction of District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.10 4-28
Number of Types of Eisenhower-assisted Activities, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.11a..... 4-29
Percent of Teachers in Districts by Span of Eisenhower-assisted Reform Activities

EXHIBIT 4.11b..... 4-30
Average Span of Eisenhower-assisted Activities, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.12 4-32
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Fund Workshops with Eisenhower Funds, Other Sources, or Not at All

EXHIBIT 4.13 4-33
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Fund Reform Activities with Eisenhower Funds, Other Sources, or Not at All

EXHIBIT 4.14 4-38
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Report Placing No, Some, or a Strong Emphasis on Recruiting Teachers of Special Student Populations

EXHIBIT 4.15 4-39
Correlation of the Emphasis on Recruitment of Teachers of Special Populations of Students

EXHIBIT 4.16 4-40
Extent of Recruitment of Teachers of Special Populations of Students, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 4.17 4-41
Percent of Participations in District Eisenhower-assisted Activities by How Teachers Come to Participate

EXHIBIT 4.18 4-42
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Use Various Strategies to Increase the Participation of Teachers in Eisenhower-assisted Activities

CHAPTER 5: DISTRICT MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

EXHIBIT 5.0..... 5-3
Conceptual Framework for This Evaluation

CHAPTER 5: DISTRICT MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (Continued)

EXHIBIT 5.1a 5-8
Percent of Teachers in Districts Where State and District Mathematics and Science Standards and Assessments Exist

EXHIBIT 5.1b 5-9
Percent of Teachers in Districts Where Eisenhower-assisted Activities Are Aligned "to a Large Extent" with State and/or District Standards and/or Assessments (Where Such Standards and Assessments Exist)

EXHIBIT 5.1c 5-11
Degree of Alignment Between Eisenhower-assisted Activities and Standards and Assessments, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 5.2 5-13
Percent of Teachers in Districts According to Eisenhower Coordinator's Roles within the District Office

EXHIBIT 5.3a 5-15
Percent of Teachers in Districts in which Eisenhower Activities Coordinate (Co-fund and/or Work Closely) with Other Programs

EXHIBIT 5.3b 5-17
Extent of Co-Funding of Eisenhower-assisted Activities with Those of Other Federal Programs, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 5.3c 5-18
Extent of Co-Funding of Eisenhower-assisted Activities with Those of Other Federal Programs, Interaction of District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 5.4 5-25
Percent of Teachers in Districts According to Status of District Performance Indicators for Professional Development

EXHIBIT 5.5 5-27
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Use Different Methods to Assess Teachers' Professional Development Needs

EXHIBIT 5.6 5-28
Percent of Teachers in Districts That Use Different Methods to Evaluate Eisenhower-assisted Activities

EXHIBIT 5.7 5-31
Percent of Teachers in Districts in Which Eisenhower Staff Provide Different Types of Guidance about Professional Development to Schools and Professional Development Providers

EXHIBIT 5.8 5-32
Extent of District Continuous Improvement Efforts, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

CHAPTER 5: DISTRICT MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (Continued)

EXHIBIT 5.9a 5-36
Percent of Teachers in Districts Reporting That None, Some, Most, or All Professional Development Activities Are Planned at the District, School, and Cluster Levels

EXHIBIT 5.9b 5-37
Extent to Which Professional Development Activities Are Planned at the School vs. District Level, Overall and by District Poverty and District Size

EXHIBIT 5.10 5-39
Percent of Teachers in Districts with Different Types of Teacher Involvement in School- and Cluster-level Professional Development Planning

EXHIBIT 5.11 5-48
Relationship of District Management to Features of Professional Development

CHAPTER 6: STATE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTEES: DESIGN, CHARACTERISTICS, AND OPERATION OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

EXHIBIT 6.0 6-3
Conceptual Framework for This Evaluation

EXHIBIT 6.1 6-7
Characteristics of SAHE Grantees

EXHIBIT 6.2 6-11
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects with Primary Activities That Cover Mathematics, Science, and Other Subject Areas

EXHIBIT 6.3 6-12
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Offer "Traditional" Activities

EXHIBIT 6.4 6-13
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Offer "Reform" Activities

EXHIBIT 6.5 6-14
SAHE-grantees' Support for "Reform" Types of Activities, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.6a 6-15
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, by Contact Hours of Primary Activity

EXHIBIT 6.6b 6-16
Contact Hours of SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

CHAPTER 6: STATE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTEES: FEATURES AND MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (Continued)

EXHIBIT 6.6c 6-17
Contact Hours of SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Interaction of Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.7a 6-18
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, by Time Span of Primary Activity

EXHIBIT 6.7b 6-19
Span of SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.8a 6-20
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects Whose Primary Activity Involves Collective Participation

EXHIBIT 6.8b 6-21
Collective Participation in SAHE-grantee Projects, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.9a 6-24
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects Whose Primary Activity Focuses on Content Knowledge

EXHIBIT 6.9b 6-25
Extent of Content Knowledge Focus in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.9c 6-26
Extent of Content Knowledge Focus in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.10a 6-28
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Provide Each of Sixteen Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in Primary Activity

EXHIBIT 6.10b 6-29
Number of Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.10c 6-30
Number of Types of Opportunities for Active Learning in SAHE-grantees' Primary Activity, Interaction of Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.11 6-34
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects Whose Directors Report Placing No, Some, or a Strong Emphasis on Recruiting Teachers of Special Student Populations

CHAPTER 6: STATE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTEES: FEATURES AND MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (Continued)

EXHIBIT 6.12 6-35
Percent of Teachers in SAHE-grantee Projects, According to How Teachers Come to Participate

EXHIBIT 6.13 6-36
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Use Various Strategies to Increase Participation

EXHIBIT 6.14a 6-39
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects in which State and District Standards and Assessments Play a Role in Project Design

EXHIBIT 6.14b 6-40
Degree of Alignment between SAHE-grantees' Eisenhower Project and State and District Standards and Assessments, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.15 6-42
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Have Ongoing Feedback Mechanisms with Districts

EXHIBIT 6.16 6-43
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Support and Coordinate with District Professional Development Activities and Programs

EXHIBIT 6.17 6-44
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Work with Districts in Different Ways

EXHIBIT 6.18 6-45
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects in Which District Staff Are Involved in Planning, Implementing, or Monitoring Eisenhower-assisted Activities

EXHIBIT 6.19 6-46
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Co-fund and/or Work Closely with Other Federal Programs (When the Program Operates in the District)

EXHIBIT 6.20 6-47
Number of Types of Coordination of the SAHE-grantee Project with Districts, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.21 6-50
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects, by Status and Effect of District and State Performance Indicators on the Project

EXHIBIT 6.22 6-51
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Use Different Strategies to Assess Teachers' Professional Development Needs

CHAPTER 6: STATE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTEES: FEATURES AND MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED ACTIVITIES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (Continued)

EXHIBIT 6.23 6-53
Percent of Teachers Participating in SAHE-grantee Projects That Use Different Methods for Evaluating Activities

EXHIBIT 6.24 6-54
Extent of SAHE-grantee Continuous Improvement Efforts, Overall and by Institution Type and Departmental Affiliation

EXHIBIT 6.25 6-58
Relationship of SAHE-grantee Management to Features of Professional Development

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS FOR THE EISENHOWER PROGRAMS

EXHIBIT 7.0 7-2
Conceptual Framework for This Evaluation